

## REMARKS

The examiner refused to enter the Applicant's previous amendment on the basis that the claim amendments raised new issues which would require further consideration and search. The applicant does not understand the examiner's rationale for not entering the amendment. The claims amendments only clarified features that were already presented in the claims and would not require further search by the examiner. In order to expedite the prosecution of the present application the applicant has canceled Claims 15-17 and rewritten Claim 18 in independent form including all limitations of Claims 15-17 as originally presented. Claims depending from Claims 15-17 have been amended to depend from Claim 18. In the final Office Action the examiner has indicated that Claim 18 as amended is allowable.

Applicant is disappointed that the examiner did not substantively address any of applicant's arguments presented in the previous response to the final Office Action directed to the 112 issues and presents them again for consideration.

The examiner asserts that Claims 15-26 lack clear antecedent basis in the specification. The examiner asserts that Claim 15 lacks clear antecedent basis because the phrases "is always" and "that is soaked in....water," are not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant disagrees and brings to the attention of the examiner pg. 11 ll. 7-9. This passage discloses, *inter alia*, that "the first

chamber 11 and the second chamber 12 **are always filled with water** by having raw water or water for level adjustment respectively introduced into them.” Thus, the claim limitations are fully supported by the specification as originally filed.

The examiner further asserts that Claim 18 lacks clear antecedent basis in that a “multangular” separating wall is not disclosed. Applicant has amended claim 18 to correct a typographical error. “Multi-angular” means having more than one angle. Figures 6-18 as originally filed disclose a separating wall having more than one angle. Thus, this claim limitation is fully supported by the specification as filed. Withdrawal of the §112 rejections is requested.

Lastly, under § 112, the examiner asserts that Claim 15 is incomplete because the limitations recited in Claims 16-18 are essential. Applicant does not understand the basis for the examiner’s rejection. The applicant has disclosed many embodiments in the present application, some of which do not require the limitations recited in Claims 16-18. For example, the embodiments disclosed in Figures 6-18 do not need the limitations recited in Claims 16-18.


The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 112 rejection s.

Claim 22 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of Claim 21. Claim 21 has been amended to correct an omission that gives Claims 21 and 22

different scopes. Claim 21 now recites the location of where the floatation bag is fitted.

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:   
Patrick D. McPherson  
Reg. No. 46,255  
L. Lawton Rogers, III  
Reg. No. 24,302  
Mark C. Comtois  
Reg. No. 46,285  
D. Joseph English  
Reg. No. 42,514

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 776-7800  
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: April 20, 2004